



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,686	03/09/2001	Gary Van Nest	377882000900	9981
25226	7590	08/21/2007	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			LE, EMILY M	
755 PAGE MILL RD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			1648	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/21/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/802,686	VAN NEST, GARY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emily Le	1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 29, 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,8-10 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8-10 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claim(s)

1. Claims 6-7 and 11-15 are cancelled. Claim 18 is added. Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 16-18 are pending and under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The rejection of claims 1-5, 8-10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the [full scope] enablement requirement is withdrawn in view of Applicant's submission, wherein Applicant amended the claims. Originally, the claims were directed to the **administration** of a oligonucleotide that is greater than 6 but less than 200 nucleotides in length, wherein the oligonucleotide comprises the CpG motif, in a **subject that has been exposed to respiratory syncytial viral (RSV) infection** to suppress the infection. However, with the newly amended claims, the claims are directed to the **local administration** of a oligonucleotide that is greater than 6 but less than 200 nucleotides in length, wherein the oligonucleotide comprises the CpG motif, in a **subject that is at risk of being exposed to respiratory syncytial viral (RSV) infection** to suppress the infection.

4. Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for:

a method of suppressing a respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) infection in an individual who is at risk of being exposed to RSV comprising locally administering a composition to the individual, wherein the administration takes place 3 days before the individual is infected with RSV, wherein the composition comprises a polynucleotide, wherein the polynucleotide is SEQ ID NO: 1, to suppress the infection;

does not reasonably provide enablement for: a method of suppressing a respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) infection in an individual who is at risk of being exposed to RSV comprising locally administering a composition to the individual, wherein the composition comprises a polynucleotide that is greater than 6 but less than 200 nucleotides in length and comprises the CpG motif, at anytime prior to RSV infection, excluding 3 days before RSV infection, to suppress the infection.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As previously noted, to be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); See also *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher* 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Further, in *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) the court stated:

Art Unit: 1648

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman* [230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd Pat App Int 1986)]. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F. 2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Breadth of the claims:

The claims encompass the local administration of a oligonucleotide that is greater than 6 but less than 200 nucleotides in length, wherein the oligonucleotide comprises the CpG motif, in a subject that is at risk of being exposed to respiratory syncytial viral (RSV) infection to suppress the infection. The claims, with the exception of claim 5, are non-limiting to a particular oligonucleotide. The claims are also not limiting in the period in which the oligonucleotide must be administered to the individual prior to being exposed to RSV infection.

Nature of the invention:

The claimed invention is directed at the immunotherapeutic use of oligonucleotide comprising the CpG motif to stimulate the immune system, including the induction of Th1 immune response invoked by the production of Th1 associated

cytokines accorded by the CpG motif, to suppress RSV infection in a subject that is at risk of being exposed to RSV.

Presence or absence of working examples:

Example 2 of the disclosure provides that the intranasal administration (local administration) of a composition comprising a polynucleotide that is SEQ ID NO: 1 to an individual, cotton rats, 3 days before RSV infection, suppresses RSV infection in the individual. In the instant case, it should be noted that Example 2 is limited to the use of a single polynucleotide (SEQ ID NO: 1) and one treatment protocol (local administration 3 days prior to RSV infection). In view of this working example, it is found that the claimed invention is enabling for this scope.

From the same working example, Applicant teaches that the local administration of **SEQ ID NO: 1** to an individual at risk of RSV infection is **not effective in suppressing RSV infection** when the individual is challenged with RSV about 30 minutes after the local administration of SEQ ID NO: 1.

State of the art:

As previously stated, the involvement of a Th1 type immune response in combating against intracellular pathogens is a well-recognized general concept. The art acknowledges the importance of Th1 type immune response, which is stimulated by the production of Th1 associated cytokines, in the elimination of intracellular pathogens, including viruses. However, the art has not accredited or recognized any one particular Th1-associated cytokine to the treatment, prevention and suppression of viral infection in a subject. Specifically, the art teaches that while cytokines secreted by T helper cells

Art Unit: 1648

are of critical importance for the outcome of many infectious diseases, the production of the "right" set of cytokines can be a matter of life or death, as noted by Infante-Duarte et al. Infante-Duarte et al. further notes that in addition to a Th1 type immune response, a Th2 type immune response is also necessary. Specifically, Infante-Duarte et al. teaches that a tight control over where and when Th1 and Th2 immune responses happen is necessary to keep intracellular infections under control, and to prevent the Th1 type immune response from causing damage to the host.¹ Hence, while the importance of a Th1 type immune response is well recognized in the art, the art further notes that a balance between Th1 and Th2 type immune responses is necessary to resolve an infection.

The cytokine art also provides that the efficacy of Th1 associated cytokines, such as interleukin 2, interleukin 12 and interleukin 18, against intracellular pathogens are controversial, as evidenced by Aoki et al.,² Bohn et al.,³ Sakao et al.,⁴ Zaitseva et al.,⁵ and Masihi, K.⁶ Aoki et al. teaches that while interleukin 2 may confer good protection for non-pathogenic mycobacterial strain Bacille Calmette-Guerin (BCG), interleukin 2 does not confer protection for virulent *M. bovis* infection. Bohn et al. teaches that interleukin-12, a Th1 associated cytokine, induces different effector mechanisms that

¹ Infante-Duarte et al., Th1/Th2 balance in infection. Springer Seminars in Immunopathology, 1999, 21: 317-338. [Paragraph bridging pages 321-322, in particular.]

² Aoki et al. Use of cytokines in infection. Expert Opin. Emerg. Drugs, 2004, vol. 9, No. 2, 223-236. [Lines 4-15, left column, page 229, in particular]

³ Bohn et al., Ambiguous role of interleukin-12 in *Yersinia enterocolitica* infection in susceptible and resistant mouse strains. Infect. Immune., 1998, Vol. 66, 2213-2220. [Abstract, in particular.]

⁴ Sakao et al. IL-18-deficient mice are resistant to endotoxin-induced liver injury but highly susceptible to endotoxin shock. Int. Immunol., 1999, Vol. 11, 471-480. [Abstract, in particular.]

⁵ Zaitseva et al. Interferon gamma and interleukin 6 modulate the susceptibility of macrophages to human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. Blood, 2000, Vol. 96, 3109-3117. [Abstract, in particular]

Art Unit: 1648

result in either protection or exacerbation of a disease. Specifically, Bohn et al. notes that the administration of exogenous interleukin 12 confers protection against *Yersinia enterocolitica* in susceptible BALB/c mice, but exacerbates yersiniosis in resistant C57BL/6 mice. Sakao et al. teaches that interleukin 18, a Th1 associated cytokine, is responsible for the progression of endotoxin-induced liver injury in mice primed with interleukin 18. Zaitseva et al. teaches that both interleukin 6 and interferon gamma augment the susceptibility of monocyte-derived macrophages to infection. Masihi, K. notes that interleukin 2 increases the production of HIV in vitro, and enhances the translocation of bacteria from intestines to other organs in animal studies. In summation, the art teaches that cytokines can be inherently toxic, have unclear pharmacological behavior and also have pleiotropic effects. Hence, the art recognizes that the use of cytokine to direct treatment is unpredictable and complicated.

Additionally, while the art teaches that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif are capable of stimulating a Th1 type immune response, however, the art also teaches that the **Th1 associated cytokine profile for these oligonucleotides vary from one oligonucleotide and species of subject to the next**, as evidenced by Krieg et al.⁷ and Mutwiri et al.⁸ Krieg et al notes that **each oligonucleotide containing the CpG motif must be considered as a separate agent because the quality and type of immune stimulation induced by these oligonucleotides varies**. Krieg et al.

⁶ Masihi, K. Fighting infection using immunomodulatory agents. Expert Opin. Biol. Ther., 2001, Vol. 1, No. 4, 641-653. [Lines 15-25, left column of page 646, in particular]

⁷ Krieg et al., CpG motif in bacterial DNA and their immune effects. Annu. Rev. Immunol., 2002, Vol. 20, 709-760. [paragraph that bridge pages 716-717, in particular.]

⁸ Mutwiri et al. Biological activity of immunostimulatory CpG DNA motifs in domestic animals. Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology, 2003, Vol. 91, 89-103. [See 2nd and 3rd full paragraphs, left column of page 93; last sentence of paragraph bridging pages 89-90.]

Art Unit: 1648

particularly notes that **the type of cytokine stimulated by oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif is distinct from one oligonucleotide to the next.**

Additionally, both Krieg et al. and Mutwiri et al. note that **the level and type of immune stimulation varies depending on i) the specific nucleic acids, purines and pyrimidines, surrounding the CpG motif; ii) the spacings between CpG motifs; iii) the numbers of CpG motifs in an oligonucleotide; iv) the absence or presence of a CpG motif to the end of the oligonucleotide; and v) the context in which the CpG motif is presented in the sequence.**

The CpG art further teaches that **the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG is very species specific**, as evidenced by Mutwiri et al. Table 1 of Mutwiri et al. provides that the *in vitro* immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif varies from one species to the next. Mutwiri et al. also notes that the level of immunostimulating induced by a particular oligonucleotide is also dependent on the sequence(s) flanking the CpG motif. Specifically, Mutwiri et al. notes that the GTCGTT motif, which is the optimal motif for humans, is optimal for stimulation of lymphocyte proliferation in several species including cattle, sheep, goats, horses, pigs, dogs, cats and chickens; whereas the murine CpG motif (GACGTT) is only optimal for inbred rabbits and mice.

Furthermore, both Krieg et al. and Mutwiri et al. sets forth that the recognition of the CpG motifs requires Toll-like receptor (TLR) 9, wherein cells that express TLR-9 produce Th1 associated cytokines. However, Mutwiri et al. provides that TLR-9 has only been identified in mice and humans. Mutwiri et al. also provides that the TLR-9 is

Art Unit: 1648

differentially expressed in humans and mice. Hence, if the recognition of the CpG motif were dependent of TLR-9, then it would logically follows that the extent of the Th1 type immune response induced by the oligonucleotide would necessarily vary from one species to the next. Mutwiri et al. also sets forth that *in vitro* observations do not accurately predict what happens *in vivo*.

Moreover, the potential use of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to stimulate a Th1 type immune response that treats, prevents and suppresses infection is widely speculated in the art. However, efforts to harness the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to trigger an innate immune response that protect a host from infectious pathogen has proven to be challenging and elusive, as evidenced by Yamamoto et al.,⁹ Equils et al.,¹⁰ Agrawal et al.,¹¹ and Olbrich et al.¹² Yamamoto et al. reports that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif failed to improve the survival in mice challenged with influenza. Equils et al. teaches that such oligonucleotides can induce the HIV transcriptional regulatory elements in long terminal repeats, increasing viral replication. Agrawal et al. teaches that HIV-infected humans treated with oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif showed dose-dependent increases viral load. Lastly, Olbrich et al. teaches that the administration of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif accelerated and increased the severity of Friend retrovirus in mice. In the case of Olbrich et al., the author notes that the use of

⁹ Yamamoto et al., Oligodeoxyribonucleotides with 5'ACGT-3' or 5TCGA-3 sequence induce production of interferons. Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol. 2000, Vol. 247, 23-40.

¹⁰ Equils et al. Toll-like receptor 2 (TLR2) and TLR9 signaling resulted from HIV-long terminal repeat transactivation and HIV replication in HIV-1 transgenic mouse spleen cells: implications of simultaneous activation of TLRs on HIV replication. J. Immunol. 2003, 170, 5159-5164.

¹¹ Agrawal, et al. Was induction of HIV1 through TLR9? J. Immunol. 2003, 171, 1621-1621.

oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif for the treatment of viral infection may be a double edge sword that can resolve in effective therapy but also in acceleration of disease. Olbrich et al. notes that this double edge sword observation may be dependent on the time point of treatment.

Hence, overall, the literature notes the use of CpG to stimulate the production of cytokines, the use of cytokines to influence viral infection, and the development of a treatment regimen for diseases is unpredictable and complicated.

Amount of guidance or direction provided:

However, the working examples provided in the specification do not set forth any guidance or directions relating to the **effective use** of other polynucleotides, other than SEQ ID NO: 1 to suppress RSV infection in an individual. As noted in the art, **Th1 associated cytokine profile for these oligonucleotides vary from one oligonucleotide and species of subject to the next.** In the instant case, Applicant has not even characterized the Th1 profile induced by the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 1 and render a reasonable analysis, through a representative number of working embodiments, that polynucleotides capable of inducing the same Th1 profile would also be effective in suppressing RSV infection in an individual at risk of being exposed to RSV infection. All that Applicant has provided are conjectures that all polynucleotides comprising the CpG motif, which is recognized in the art to have immunostimulatory activities, could be used to suppress RSV infection in an individual at risk of being infected with RSV. However, it should be noted that none of these conjectures are

¹² Olbrich et al. Preinfection treatment of resistant mice with CpG oligodeoxynucleotides renders them susceptible to friend retrovirus-induced leukemia. J. Virol., 2003, 77, 10658-10662.

substantiated by any data or evidence that would reasonable allow the skilled artisan to believe that any polynucleotides comprising the CpG motif would be effective in suppressing RSV infection in an individual at risk of being exposed to RSV infection. In the instant case, in light of the art, the skilled artisan would readily art acknowledges the importance of Th1 type immune response, which is stimulated by the production of Th1 associated cytokines, in the elimination of intracellular pathogens, including viruses. However, the skilled artisan would not readily accept and believe that the stimulation of any Th1 immune response would be effective in suppressing a RSV infection in an individual at risk of RSV infection because the skilled artisan knows the importance of inducing the right set of cytokines, the right Th1 profile. In the absence of the identification of the Th1 profile that leads to the suppression of RSV infection in an individual at risk of RSV infection, the skilled artisan would not be able to practice the claimed invention without undue burden of experimentation. In the instant case, the skilled artisan would have to ascertain the Th1 profile that is necessary to suppress RSV infection in the individual and experiment with all polynucleotides having the CpG motif to determine if the Th1 profile produced from these polynucleotides is the same with the Th1 profile necessary to suppress RSV infection in an individual at risk of RSV infection. In the instant case, while it may appears that the work imposed upon the skilled artisan is routine experimentation, however, it should be noted that this is not the case. In this case, the skilled artisan would be required to perform the research and experimentation that Applicant should have all ready provided in the specification, at the time the invention was filed. Applicant is reminded that the disclosure provided in the

Art Unit: 1648

specification is limited to one protocol, suppression of RSV infection in an individual at risk of RSV infection with the local administration of SEQ ID NO: 1. Applicant has not provided a disclosure that commensurates in scope with the claimed invention. What In view of the high level of unpredictability known in the Th1, cytokine and CpG arts, it is found that the skilled artisan would not be able to practice the claimed invention without the burden of undue experimentation. Additionally, it should be noted that the working examples do not set forth any guidance or directions relating to the **effective use** of other treatment protocols, i.e., the time period in which the polynucleotide can be locally administered to effectively suppress RSV infection. In both instances, the only thing that the disclosure provides is suggestions directed to the use of other polynucleotides and other various treatment protocols. However, none of these suggestions are substantiated by any data or evidence.

Predictability or unpredictability of the art:

As discussed above, the art recognizes that the use of cytokine to direct treatment is unpredictable and complicated. The art also recognizes that use of CpG to stimulate cytokine production, the use of the induced cytokine to influence viral infection, and the development of treatment regimen unpredictable and complicated.

The art additionally teaches that the efforts to harness the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to trigger an innate immune response that protect a host from infectious pathogen has proven to be challenging and elusive.

Quantity of experimentation necessary:

Art Unit: 1648

Extreme undue burden of experimentation would be imposed upon the skilled artisan practicing the claimed invention. As stated above, Applicant has not provided much, if any, guidance or direction relating to the claimed invention. All that Applicant has provided is a conclusion that is made on the basis of generalized concepts that are well known in the art. And the formation of a conclusion based on generalized concepts renders the conclusion flawed. Generalized concepts are directed to support a general direction of studies or research; however, they do not support concrete conclusions. Concrete conclusions must be substantiated by facts, including evidence. In the instant, while the general direction of research may be outlined for the skilled artisan, the skilled artisan would not readily be able to practice the claimed invention without the undue burden of experimentation. The path that the skilled artisan must take in his research is marked with many challenges that are recognized in the art, including the complex nature of oligonucleotides containing CpG motif and the complexity of the immune system, including the Th1 type immune response and the functional characteristics of its associated cytokines. Hence, in view of the lack of any guidance in the specification concerning the effective use of oligonucleotides to suppress RSV infection in an individual at risk of RSV infection; the unpredictability of oligonucleotides containing CpG motif to stimulate specific immune response; and the inherent toxicity, the unclear pharmacological behavior, and the pleiotropic effects of cytokines; the skilled artisan would not be able to reasonably practice the claimed invention without an undue burden experimentation. Thus, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, 1st paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F. 2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Miscellaneous Communication

5. It is noted that in response to the previous enablement rejection, Applicant has requested that the Office provides an affidavit under 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2) stating facts within the knowledge of the Office as to why the rejection should be maintained.

This request has been considered, however, it is not granted. 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2) provides: **When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.** [emphasis added.]

In the instant case, Applicant is reminded that neither of the enablement rejections, full or partial scope, is based on the facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the current examiner. The rejections are based on the Wands factors, as required for an enablement rejection, as a whole.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. In response to the double patenting rejections, Applicant submits that the rejections will be addressed upon the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant's submission has been noted. However, in view of the newly amended claims, the noted provisional double patenting rejections are withdrawn.

Conclusion

8. No claims are allowed.
9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Le whose telephone number is (571) 272 0903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce R. Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1648

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey S. Parkin/
Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1648

/E.Le/